

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

KATINA HASLAM,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 16-cv-11793  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

COMMISSIONER OF  
SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER (1) GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF #11), (2) DENYING DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF #14), AND (3)  
REMANDING PLAINTIFF’S APPLICATION FOR DISABILITY  
BENEFITS FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**

In this action, Plaintiff Katina Haslam (“Plaintiff”) challenges the denial of her application for disability insurance benefits. (*See* Compl., ECF #1.) Plaintiff and the Commissioner of Social Security (“Defendant”) have now filed cross-motions for summary judgment. (*See* ECF ## 11, 14.)

On February 28, 2017, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which he recommended that the Court (1) deny Defendant’s motion, (2) grant Plaintiff’s motion in part, and (3) remand Plaintiff’s application for disability benefits to the Administrative Law Judge pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (the “R&R”). (*See* ECF #17.) At the conclusion of the R&R, the

Magistrate Judge informed the parties that if they wanted to seek review of his recommendation, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.* at 14, Pg. ID 782.)

Neither party has filed an objection to the R&R. The failure to file objections to an R&R waives any further right to appeal. *See Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987). Likewise, the failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

Accordingly, because neither party has filed any objections to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommendation to deny Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, to grant Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment in part to the extent it seeks a remand, and to remand this action to the Administrative Law Judge is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that (1) Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #14) is **DENIED**; (2) Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #16) is **GRANTED IN PART** to the extent it seeks a remand and **DENIED IN PART** to the extent it seeks an award of benefits; and (3) Plaintiff's application for disability benefits is **REMANDED** to the Administrative Law Judge pursuant to

sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings consistent with this Order and the R&R.

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 15, 2017

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 15, 2017, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda  
Case Manager  
(313) 234-5113